

MARK J. AARONSON LAWRINGE D. BLOGMSTEIN NEIL F. BAENES RICHARD V CAPLAN ROBERT J. CEGALA ROBERT S. DEUTSCH SURAN BTRA PETER J. FAZIO MARK R. PERNETEIN CRAIG P. FENNO
MICHABL M. FUTTERMAN
ANDREW I. KAPLAN
STEVEN Z. KRONOVET
PHILIF D. LERNER
NICHOLAF J. MAROTTA
DAVID A. MAYERI
ROBBRT S. MELNICK
DANIEL NESETM

NANCY L. PENNIE JAY A. RAPPAPORT CAROL E. RUSSELL BARBARA A. RYAN BARRY M. SCHREIBER DAWN C. SHAFIRO ALISON R. SHIBLDS NANCY A. STEPROE ELLIOTT J. ZUCKER

VIA FAX: (212) 805-7933

July 5, 2007

HONORABLE ANDREW J. PECK UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 500 Pearl Street, Room1370 New York, N.Y. 10007

Re:

Sakif, et al. v. United States

Federal Docket No.; 06-CIV-2719 (AJP)

Our File No.: 0063-063

MEMO ENDORSED-

Dear Judge Peck:

Please allow this letter to formally advise you that Bronx Lebanon Hospital has decided not to pursue any further appeal or judicial review of the federal government's mid-litigation reversal denying FTCA coverage in this matter.

The immediate practical effect of this decision is straightforward, because it means that the United States of America is no longer a proper defendant in this matter, and must be dismissed. In any normal circumstance, this would result in any remaining claims being remanded to state court. Unfortunately, because of the procedural manner used by the plaintiff (i.e., starting simultaneous actions in both federal and state court, rather than waiting for the state court action to be removed to federal court), the court is still going to have to decide the plaintiff's pending application, which seeks to add the "state court" defendants directly to the federal action.

With regards to that application, we would maintain the position we articulated in our initial opposition to the plaintiff's motion, and respectfully suggest that it would be inappropriate, especially in the case in which discovery is almost complete, to suddenly add as defendants parties over whom this Court would normally have

July 18, 2007

RE: SAKIF V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

no jurisdiction, since there are no federal questions involved and there is no diversity. We would again submit that the appropriate remedy would be for the plaintiff to simply resume prosecution of the state court action. If there are any disputes with regard to available defenses, or the need to repeat discovery, the presiding state court judge will be perfectly capable of dealing with those disputes.

Thank you for your courtesy with regard to this matter.

Very truly yours,

ELLIOTT J. ZVOKER

EJZ:cjm

VIA FAX:

cc: PEGALIS & ERICKSON (516) 684-2939

Attn: Rhonda L. Meyer

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE (212) 637-2750

Attn: Matthew L. Schwartz

DWYER & TAGLIA (212) 227-6050

Attn: Peter Taglia Esq.

MEMO ENDORSED

Stor antollar.

yout on the states of

SO ONDERED:

Hon. Andrew/Joy Peck United/States Magistrate Judge

BY FAX

FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET



ANDREW 1. PECK UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

Southern District of New York **United States Courthouse** 500 Pearl Street, Room 1370 New York, N.Y. 10007-1312

Fax No.:

(212) 805-7933 Telephone No.: (212) 805-0036

Dated: July 18, 2007

Total Number of Pages:

то	FAX NUMBER
Rhonda L. Meyer, Esq.	516-684-2939
Matthew L. Schwartz, Esq.	212-637-2750
Peter Taglia, Esq.	212-227-6050
Elliot J. Zucker, Esq.	212-593-6970

TRANSCRIPTION:

MEMO ENDORSED 7/18/07

The Court is putting this case on the "suspense" docket for a period of up to 90 days. During that time, plaintiff is to resume prosecution of its prior state court action, including adding (or trying to add) any additional parties (plaintiff or defendant) to that action. Plaintiff is to report on the status of the state court proceedings by 9/21/07.